

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 remain pending are now pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration. This reply contains no amendment.

Priority Acknowledgment

The priority acknowledgment in the Office Action Summary still incorrectly checked box 12c). Since this application is a § 371 National stage application, applicant need not submit any certified priority document, which is automatically forwarded to the USPTO. Accordingly, boxes 12a) and 12(3) should be checked.

Claim Objection

The examiner objected to claims 1 and 3 because they are deemed to be improperly numbered. Applicant traverses this objection because there is no requirement anywhere that applicant has to renumber the claims. In fact, APPLICANTS ARE NOT PERMITTED to renumber them. It is the examiner's duty to renumber them after the claims have been allowed. See MPEP § 608.01(j).

Art Rejection

Claims 1-5, 7, and 8 now stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hatae (USP 5,675,655). Claim 6 now stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hatae in view of Yanagawa (USP 5,233,664). Applicant traverses these rejections for the following reasons:

First, in contrast to the examiner's assertion, Hatae does not disclose an array speaker. Rather, Hatae merely discloses generating right and left signals for a stereo microphone. In this respect, Hatae fails to provide any directivity control for any speakers. In fact, Hatae is completely silent regarding any speaker.

Second, Hatae and Yanagawa both fail to teach the claimed directivity control unit that generates two different directivity control information (first and second) to concurrently provide two different directional characteristics at the same time for the same input signal to speakers. Should the examiner maintain the same rejections, applicant request the examiner to specifically point out where Hatae discloses a directivity control for speakers or how Hatae is being applied to reject independent claims 1 and 3.

Third, applicant submits that the combination urged by the examiner would not have been tenable since Hatae is merely directed to generating right and left signals for a stereo microphone and not for controlling signals applied to speakers.

For at least these reasons, applicant submits the applied references would not have disclosed or taught the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

18 AUGUST 2008

DATE

/Lyle Kimms 081808/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)